MASTER CONTRACT FOR IT SERVICES RFP# SPB06-1263B

EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION

June 19, 2006

PREPARED BY: DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES DIVISION

MASTER CONTRACT FOR IT SERVICES RFP# SPB 06-1263B EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION

Table of Contents

SECTION I - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
SECTION II - PROPOSAL SUMMARY	
SECTION III - SCORING CRITERIA6	
SECTION IV – ORGANIZATION OF THE PROPOSAL SCORING	
SECTION V – OFFEROR QUALIFICATIONS SCORING	
SECTION VI - PROJECT EXPERIENCE SCORING	
SECTION VII - REFERENCES SCORING	
SECTION VIII - RECOMMENDATION	

SECTION I - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Request for Proposal (SPB 06-1263B), seeking to replace the State of Montana's existing MIS Services Contract and Small project Professional IT Services Provider Contract, was prepared and released for competitive bidding on March 13, 2006.

The goal was to replace these contracts with a new process. The new process will be a two-tier model. Tier One consists of this Request for Proposal (RFP), which qualifies vendors to be on the roster of the Master Contract. The selection criteria to make the roster consisted of primarily offeror qualifications, project experience and references. Rates/cost and staff qualifications are not a part of Tier One and thus were not included in this RFP. They are part of the Tier Two process.

Tier Two will utilize a selection process to select a Contractor for specific project tasks under a Statement of Work (SOW) issued by an ordering agency with Contractors submitting proposals to the ordering agency. ITSD Procurement Service Bureau (PSB) will work the agencies to set up the selection process.

Project Experience and References were sought in the following 13 Service Categories:

- Analysis, Design and Planning Services
- Business Process Management Services
- Distributed Application Services
- FileNET Services
- GIS Services
- Information Systems Security Services
- Internet, Intranet, and e-Government Services
- Mainframe Applications Services
- Oracle/PeopleSoft Services
- Project Management Services
- Public Safety Services
- Quality Assurance Services
- Telecommunications Services

Offerors were allowed to submit responses for as many Service Categories as they felt qualified to provide. Each Service Category was scored independently. Responses were evaluated on organization of proposal, offeror qualifications, project experience, and references for each Service Category.

The On-site Vendor Conference was held March 28, and a Vendor Conference Call was held March 30 for those who could not attend the on-site conference. On April 7, clarification requests were received from various offerors. The State posted responses to the clarification questions by April 21. By May 8, the State Procurement Bureau received responses from 67 offerors. Each response was checked for compliance with the RFP's general terms and conditions.

SECTION II - PROPOSAL SUMMARY

A total of 67 proposals were received. The responsive proposals were subjected to a complete evaluation, which is summarized in this report. Full details of the evaluation are available from PSB upon request.

Total Proposals Received: 67

Total Number of Service Categories applied to by all Offerors: 237 Average # of Service Categories applied to by each Offeror: 3.5

	Master Contract for IT Services SERVICE CATEGORIES														
	Proposals Received 237	Analysis, Design & Planning	Business Process management	Distributed Applications	FileNet Services	GIS	information Systems Security	nternet, Intranet, & eGovernment	Mainframe Applications	Oracle-PeopleSoft svcs	Project Management Svcs	Public Safety Svcs	Quality Assurance	Felecommunications	Tatala
1	Total Companies 67 ACRO	X	В	X	Ĭ.	Ð	Ir	X	X	X	X	P	0	T	Totals 6
2	ALL CONSULTING	X		X		X		X	**	**	X				5
3	AMDEC			X				X	X						3
4	AMEC					X									1
5	ANALYSTS INTERNATIONAL	X		X				X			X				4
6	ASSURE IT	X	X	X			X	X	X		X		X		8
7	AUTOMATION & MANAGEMENT	X		X				X		X					4
8	AXIOM IT SOLUTIONS	X		X		X		X			X	X			6
9	BHD PARTNERS	X		X					X	X	X				5
10	BIG SKY SOFTWARE SOLUTIONS			X											1
11	COMPUTER CONSULTING CORP (CCC)	X	X	X				X	X				X	X	7
12	CLIENT SOLV			X											1
13	COFFEE CUP CONSULTING			X					X						2
14	COMPUTER GEEX			X			X								2
15	COMPUTER SHOPPE (CTG)													X	1
16	COMSYS	X		X		X		X	X		X		X		7
17	CONFLUENCE INC			X		X									2
18	COPLAN	X											X		2
19	CRI	X	X	X			X	X			X		X		7
20	CROSS USA	X		X					X						3
21	DJ&A	X				X					X	X			4
22	DTM			X		X									2
23	DYE MANAGEMENT GROUP	X	X								X				3
24	FEDERAL ENGINEERING	X									X	X		X	4
25	FOUNDATION FIRST (1ST)			X				X			X				3
26	FOX	X	X								X		X		4
27	FRONT DESK	X		X											2

28	GCS RESEARCH					X									1
29	GEO DATA SERVICES					X									1
30	GEO DECISIONS	X		X		X									3
31	GOLD SYSTEMS			X		X		X							3
32	HAAG CONSULTING	X							X	X					3
33	HCL	X	X	X	X		X		X		X		X	X	9
34	HERBERT CONSULTING										X			X	2
35	INSURE WORX	X	X	X			X	X	X		X		X		8
36	ISMS					X					X			X	3
37	IT IMPLEMENTERS			X				X							2
38	JDM			X											1
39	KADRMAS, LEE & JACKSON					X									1
40	KERNEL PROCESSING	X		X							X				3
41	KIMBALL & ASSOCIATES											X			1
42	LGS	X		X				X						X	4
43	LUPINE LOGIC			X		X									2
44	MARSHAL GIS					X									1
45	MAXIMUS	X	X	X			X	X		X	X		X		8
46	MSI										X				1
47	MTG MANAGEMENT COMPANY	X					X				X	X	X		5
48	NORTHRUP GRUMMAN	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	13
49	PBS&J	X	X	X		X		X			X		X		7
50	PREMIER DATA SERVICES	X		X		X	X				X				5
51	PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE	X									X		X		3
52	QNEXSYS	X		X										X	3
53	QUALITY CONSULTING SVCS	X		X					X		X		X		5
54	RADIANT	X		X							X				3
55	SYNESIS7	X		X				X			X		X		5
56	SKYLINE							X			X			X	3
57	SYSTEST LABS												X		1
58	TECHNICAL EDGE	X		X			X								3
59	TEK SYSTEMS	X		X			X		X				X		5
60	TEMPEST TECH							X							1
61	TETRA TECH					X		X							2
62	USER SOLUTIONS		X												1
63	VERTEX			X							X		X		3
64	VISIONNET													X	1
65	WESTCON			X					X						2
66	WESCO	X		X		X	X	X			X		X		7
67	WISEPRO			X				X		X					3
	Totals	36	11	43	2	20	12	24	15	7	31	6	19	11	237

Rank 2 9 1 13 5 8 4 7 11 3 12 6 9

SECTION III - SCORING CRITERIA

Responsive proposals were reviewed by the evaluation team utilizing the following "points-earned" matrix:

Proposal Organization	2%
Offeror Qualifications	33%
Project Experience	50%
References	15%
Total	100%

Breakdown:

Organization of Proposal	2% of points for a poss	sible 2,000 points
Category	Section of RFP	Point Value
A. Sections	1.6.1.1	250
B. Notebook	1.6.1.2	750
C. Cover Letter	1.6.1.3	1,000

Offeror Qualifications	33% of points for a possible 33,000 points				
Category	Section of RFP	Point Value			
A. Years in Business	4.1.1.1	1,000			
B. Training	4.1.1.2	2,000			
C. Managing the Contract	4.1.2.1	4,000			
D. Problem Resolution	4.1.2.2	4,000			
E. Communications	4.1.2.3	4,000			
F. Change Management Procedures	4.1.2.4	4,000			
G. Invoicing procedures	4.1.2.5	4,000			
H. Monthly Reporting	4.1.2.6	4,000			
I. Contract Office	4.1.2.7	2,000			
J. Contract Manager	4.1.3.1	1,000			
K. Contract Liaison	4.1.3.2	1,000			
L. State Government Experience	4.1.4	1,000			
M. Experience with Master Contracts	4.1.5	1,000			

Project Experience	50% of points for a possible 50,000 points
	(25% for each of 2 projects)

Category	Section of RFP	Point Value (ea	a) Point Value (total)
A. Customer	Appendix C	1,000	2,000
B. Project Description	Appendix C		
1. Project Title	Appendix C	0	0
2. Project Start and Complete Dates	Appendix C	1,000	2,000
3. Project Scope	Appendix C	500	1,000
4. Project Objectives	Appendix C	500	1,000
5. Project Stakeholders	Appendix C	1,000	2,000
6. Budget/Actual Cost	Appendix C	2,000	4,000
7. Methodologies	Appendix C	5,000	10,000
8. Company's Role	Appendix C	4,000	8,000
9. Risk	Appendix C	2,000	4,000
10. Project Status	Appendix C	3,000	6,000
D. Deliverables	Appendix C	5,000	10,000

References	15% of points for a possible 15,000 points					
Category	Section of RFP	Point Value (ea) Point Value (total)			
A. On Time	Attachment A	1,250	2,500			
B. Tasks as Required	Attachment A	1,250	2,500			
C. Knowledgeable	Attachment A	1,250	2,500			
D. Value	Attachment A	1,250	2,500			
E. Satisfied	Attachment A	1,250	2,500			
F. Use Again	Attachment A	1,250	2,500			

SECTION IV - ORGANIZATION OF THE PROPOSAL SCORING

A total of 2,000 points was available for the organization of the proposal. Offerors were highly encouraged to provide proposals in a three-ring binder (750 pts). Offerors were required to organize their proposal into sections that followed the format of the RFP, and the proposal was to have tabs separating each section and appendix (250 pts). A cover letter had to be supplied with each proposal. The cover letter was to identify all Service Categories for which they were applying (1,000 pts).

SECTION V – OFFEROR QUALIFICATIONS SCORING

The State is interested in the Offeror's years in business, training, contract management skills and experience, problem resolution skills, communications, change management procedures, invoicing procedures, monthly reporting, key contract personnel, state government experience, and experience with master contracts. Offerors were asked to thoroughly address questions in each of the categories. A total of 33,000 points was available.

Offeror responses for Qualifications and Project Experience were scored based on the following scoring matrix:

- **Superior Response (95-100%):** A superior response is a highly comprehensive, excellent reply that meets all of the requirements of the RFP. In addition, the response covers areas not originally addressed within the RFP and includes additional information and recommendations that would prove both valuable and beneficial to the agency.
- Good Response (85-94%): A good response meets all the requirements of the RFP and demonstrates in a clear and concise manner a thorough knowledge and understanding of the project, with no deficiencies noted.
- Fair Response (60-84%): A fair response minimally meets most requirements set forth in the RFP. The offeror demonstrates some ability to comply with guidelines and requirements of the project, but knowledge of the subject matter is limited.
- **Failed Response (0-59%):** A failed response does not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP. The offeror has not demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the subject matter.

The items that the offerors were asked to address were:

<u>Years in Business (1,000 points)</u>. Offerors were asked to specify how long the company submitting the proposal had been in the business of providing services similar to those requested in the RFP.

<u>Training (2,000 points).</u> Offerors were asked to describe their company's approach to training and to

provide specific examples that illustrate the company's commitment to staff training.

<u>Contract Management (4,000 points)</u>. Offerors were asked to discuss how the contract would be managed and to address contract compliance, resources, responsibilities and project oversight.

<u>Problem Resolution (4,000 points).</u> Offerors were asked to describe their company's approach to problem resolution and to address problem reporting, resolution and escalation procedures.

<u>Communications (4,000 points).</u> Offers were asked to describe the mode and frequency of communications with their clients including staff availability, meetings, status updates, written documentation and any policy on returning phone calls and email.

<u>Change Management Procedures (4,000 points).</u> Offerors were asked to describe their change management procedures and to address if the procedures are documented and available to the State.

<u>Invoicing Procedures (4,000 points).</u> Offerors were asked to detail their invoicing procedures, for both fixed price projects and time/material projects.

<u>Monthly Reporting (4,000 points)</u>. Offerors were asked to describe their company's reporting methods, including project status and billing.

<u>Contract Office (2,000 points)</u>. Offerors were required to identify the location of the office that would manage the contract and detail how they provide effective and efficient contract management from this location.

<u>Contract Manager (1,000 points)</u>. The Offeror's Contract Manager is the single point of contract for the State's Contract Manager. The Offeror's Contract Manager is responsible for the coordination of all contract issues, conflicts, or disagreements. The Offerors were required to submit the name and resume of their Contract Manager.

<u>Contract Liaison (1,000 points)</u>. The Contract Liaison is responsible for providing contract status reports by the 10th of each month to the State's CL. The Offerors were required to submit the name and resume of their CL.

<u>State Government Experience (1,000 points)</u>. The Offerors were asked to list and describe any previous experience their company had in working with state governments. Offerors were asked to list the number years of experience as well as a listing of at least three major projects relative to the Service Category for which they were applying.

<u>Project Manager (2,000 points).</u> The Offerors were required to name a Project Manager (PM) to be in place for each project undertaken. Each PM will be the single point of contact to the State Project Manager, and will assume responsibility for the coordination of day-to-day project activities.

<u>Contract Liaison (1,000 points).</u> The Offerors were required to name a Contract Liaison (CL) to be in place for the duration of the contract. The CL will provide contract status reports to the State CL on a monthly basis.

<u>State Government Experience (4,000 points).</u> Offerors were asked to list and describe any previous experience, indicating the number of years of experience they had in working with other state governments. They were also asked to provide at least 3 major projects relative to the Service Category they were applying for and include project description, date started, date completed, total cost, and the Offeror's role.

Experience with Master Contracts Offerors were asked to list and describe any previous experience they had with the MIS Services Contract for the State of Montana, including the Small Project Professional contracts, or any experience with other government master contracts. They were asked to indicate the number of years of experience with the master contract(s), and provide a listing of at least 3 major projects under the master contract(s) and include project description, date started, date completed, total cost, and the Offeror's role.

SECTION VI - PROJECT EXPERIENCE SCORING

Offerors were to provide information on two projects that they have completed within the Service Category proposed. 50,000 total points were available - 25,000 for each project. The projects submitted were to illustrate the Offeror's role in the project and their experience relative to the Service Sategory being offered. Preferred were projects that had been completed, are recent, and where the customer was a government entity. Such projects received higher scores. In the case of a project that is ongoing, they were to provide information regarding the current status of the project, such as milestones and completed deliverables. The RFP stressed that it was important they provide complete and detailed responses.

Project # (25,000 total possible pts)	Possible Points
Describe the customer, include: Name Location Type of Entity (government, non-profit, financial, manufacturing, etc)	1,000
Project title	0
Project start and complete dates	1,000
3. Project Scope	500
4. Project Objectives	500
5. Project Stakeholders	1,000
6a. What was the overall budget or estimated cost? 6b. What was the budget or estimated cost for your company's services?	1,000
7a. What was the final actual cost? 7b. What was the actual budget or estimated cost for your company's services?	1,000
Describe in detail the methodologies that you employed, with supporting documentation	5,000
Describe your company's role in the project. (Or Describe your role as an individual).	4,000
10. Describe any risk assessment performed for the project or any risk control utilized.	2,000
Describe how you track and report project status. Include frequency and audience.	3,000
11D. List and describe the deliverables of this project, and attach an example of one of the deliverables (i.e. one of the artifacts).	5,000
Total	25,000

SECTION VII - REFERENCES SCORING

Offerors were to submit a completed reference form for each project. The reference forms contained 6 statements. The customer completed the form by indicating a value 1 to 4 depending on their level of agreement with the statement. Customers signed the reference form and it was to be included in the proposal. Each reference had a possible 7,500 points, for 15,000 total points.

The Customer References were asked to rate the Offerors using the following scale:

Rating	Point Value
4 – Strongly Agree/Very Positive	1250
3 – Agree/Positive	938
2 – Neutral	625
1 – Disagree/ Negative	313

Customer references were asked to rate the Offeror's performance on the following:

- A. This company ensured the project deliverables were completed on time and within the agreed budget.
- B. This company provided the appropriate resources to the project.
- C. This company was knowledgeable in providing the services identified per the service Category above.
- D. The business relationship with this company was positive and cooperative, verses negative and adversarial.
- E. The company provided open, timely communications, and was responsive to our needs and requirements.
- F. I would choose to work with this company again.

SECTION VIII - RECOMMENDATION

The evaluation committee recommends that the State of Montana execute a contract with the offerors as specified in the Service Category scoring tables that follow. The Offerors recommended are the ones highlighted in yellow and with a "YES" in the Make the Cut column.

	Master Contract for 11						
	Services	Sa	တ				
		od	ö	Ce			re)
	<u>Service Category:</u> Analysis, Design & Planning	Organization of Proposal	Offeror Qualifications	Project Experience	References	Total	Awarded (70% of top score)
	Axiom IT	2,000	32,600	48,200	14,688	97,488	
	Wesco	2,000	32,600	47,800	14,376	96,776	
	Maximus	2,000	32,200	46,900	15,000	96,100	
	Insure Worx	2,000	32,200	45,700	15,000	94,900	
5	Kernel Processing	2,000	31,800	45,750	15,000	94,550	
6	Fox	2,000	29,500	48,300	14,376	94,176	YES
7	Front Desk	2,000	32,500	42,900	15,000	92,400	YES
8	DJ&A	2,000	29,450	44,550	15,000	91,000	YES
9	Analysts International	2,000	31,900	41,200	15,000	90,100	YES
10	Automation & Management	2,000	32,200	40,325	15,000	89,525	YES
11	Assure IT	2,000	29,900	42,475	14,688	89,063	YES
12	Northrop Grumman	2,000	32,600	39,900	14,376	88,876	YES
	Sysnesis7	2,000	25,800	45,500	15,000	88,300	YES
14	MTG Management	2,000	32,400	39,500	13,752	87,652	YES
15	Public Knowledge	2,000	30,300	38,150	14,688	85,138	YES
16	Dye Management	2,000	29,000	37,500	15,000	83,500	YES
17	Coplan	2,000	31,900	34,600	14,688	83,188	YES
18	Premier Data	2,000	30,600	35,450	15,000	83,050	YES
19	Geo Decisions	2,000	32,700	33,900	13,752	82,352	YES
20	QCS	2,000	30,900	35,000	14,376	82,276	YES
21	CCC	2,000	32,200	32,100	13,752	80,052	YES
22	Qnexsys	2,000	27,150	33,350	15,000	77,500	
	PBS&J	1,750	32,000	29,650	13,440	76,840	YES
24	All Consulting	2,000	24,800	35,025	15,000		
	Cross USA	2,000		33,050		76,290	
26	Technical Edge	2,000	28,000	30,150	15,000	75,150	
	CRI	2,000	28,400	28,850	15,000	74,250	
	Tek Systems	2,000	31,850	26,800	12,190	72,840	
	LGS	1,750	20,400	33,950	14,064	70,164	YES
30	Federal Engineering	2,000	32,200	20,400	15,000	69,600	
	ACRO	2,000	20,200	29,725	13,438	65,363	
	BHd	2,000	30,000	17,600	15,000	64,600	
	HCL	2,000	32,250	21,700	7,500	63,450	
	Comsys	2,000	31,400	14,150	15,000	62,550	
	Radiant	1,750	18,700	27,500	13,752	61,702	
	Haag Consulting	2,000	18,600	26,150			
	שיייי פי	_,000	. 5,550	,	,	= : , :=0	

Master Contract for IT Services Service Category: Business Process Management	Organization of Proposal	Offeror Qualifications	Project Experience	References	Total	Awarded (70% of top score)
1 Fox	2,000	29,500	48,400	15,000	94,900	YES
2 HCL	2,000	32,250	45,550	15,000	94,800	YES
3 Northrop Grumman	2,000	32,600	45,350	13,752	93,702	YES
4 Maximus	2,000	32,200	43,900	15,000	93,100	YES
5 CCC	2,000	32,200	43,650	15,000	92,850	YES
6 Dye Management	2,000	29,000	48,050	13,440	92,490	YES
7 CRI	2,000	28,400	45,050	14,688	90,138	YES
8 Insure Worx	2,000	32,200	25,000	14,688	73,888	YES
9 User Solutions	2,000	27,300	29,200	12,816	71,316	YES
o PBS&J	1,750	32,000	20,550	5,940	60,240	NO
1 Assure IT	2,000	29,900	*	13,128	45,028	NO

^{*}See eval notes.

		<u></u>					1
	Master Contract for IT Services	Proposal	ns	ø			
		ď	Offeror Qualifications	Project Experience			Make the cut (70% of top score)
		P	<u>ic</u> a	rie	es		cui
		o	ii.	d) Juc	ta	he op
	Service Category:	o	'n	ũ	References	Total	Make the cut % of top sco
	Distributed Applications	zati	or (ect	3ef	-	lak %o
	• •	ıni	erc	roj	_		20%
		Organization of	Q I	₽.			
	Andrew IT						
	Axiom IT	2,000	32,600	50,000	14,688	99,288	YES
	AMDEC	2,000	32,200	50,000	15,000	99,200	YES
	Insure Worx	2,000	32,200	49,950	15,000	99,150	YES
	Wesco	2,000	32,600	49,400	15,000	99,000	YES
	HCL Kernel Processing	2,000 2,000	32,250	49,200	15,000	98,450	YES YES
	Maximus	2,000	31,800	49,600	15,000	98,400	
	JDM	2,000	32,200 31,900	49,050 49,200	15,000 15,000	98,250	YES YES
	Synesis7	2,000	31,300	49,050	15,000	98,100 97,350	YES
	Geo Decisions	2,000	31,300	47,050	13,440	95,390	YES
	Assure IT	2,000	29,900	48,650	14,688	95,238	YES
	Analysts International	2,000	31,900	44,200	14,688	92,788	YES
	Northrop Grumman	2,000	32,600	43,700	14,376	92,676	YES
	Premier Data	2,000	30,600	44,700	15,000	92,300	YES
	Front Desk	2,000	32,500	41,750	15,000	91,250	YES
	Gold Systems	2,000	30,000	43,700	15,000	90,700	YES
	Computer Consulting Corp	2,000	32,200	41,750	13,128	89,078	YES
	Wisetek Providers	1,750	28,850	43,250	15,000	88,850	YES
	Automation & Management	2,000	32,200	41,050	13,440	88,690	YES
	Coffee Cup Consulting	2,000	23,900	47,400	15,000	88,300	YES
21	Technical Edge	2,000	28,000	41,000	15,000	86,000	YES
	Quality Consulting Services	2,000	30,900	37,000	14,376	84,276	YES
	DTM	2,000	29,800	38,050	14,376	84,226	YES
24	Cross USA	2,000	27,800	39,450	14,376	83,626	YES
25	CRI Advantage	2,000	28,400	36,950	15,000	82,350	YES
26	Client Solv	1,200	23,900	41,650	15,000	81,750	YES
27	Computer Geex	2,000	30,900	34,200	14,376	81,476	YES
28	Foundation First	2,000	31,500	39,800	7,500		YES
	PBS&J	1,750	32,000	30,750	15,000	79,500	YES
	Tek Systems	2,000	31,850	30,000	15,000	78,850	YES
31	Lupine Logic	2,000	24,800	34,800	15,000	76,600	YES
	Qnexsys	2,000	27,150	39,600	7,500	76,250	YES
	Radiant	1,750	18,700	41,600	13,752	75,802	YES
	Confluence	2,000	30,000	32,200	11,254	75,454	YES
	Vertex *	1,000	27,000	43,150	*	71,150	YES
	Big Sky Software	2,000	28,200	34,850	6,095	71,145	YES
	All Consulting	2,000	24,800	28,800	15,000	70,600	YES
	Westcon	2,000	26,200	27,100	15,000	70,300	YES
	IT Implementers	2,000	25,600	26,600	14,688	68,888	NO
	BHD	2,000	30,000	21,350	15,000	68,350	NO
	LGS	1,750	20,400	30,350	14,064	66,564	NO
42	Comsys	2,000	31,400	13,650	14,064		NO
43	ACRO	2,000	20,200	25,500	12,189	59,889	NO

Service Category: Filenet Services	Organization of Proposa	Offeror Qualifications	Project Experience	References	Total	Awarded (70% of top score)
HCL	2,000	32,250	48,500	15,000	97,750	YES
Northrop Grumman	2,000	32,600	41,500	13,752	89,852	YES

Master Contract for 11	_					
Service Category: GIS	Organization of Proposal	Offeror Qualifications	Project Experience	References	Total	Awarded (70% of top score)
1 Wesco	2,000	32,600	50,000	14,376	98,976	YES
2 Tetra Tech	2,000	32,200	50,000	14,376	98,576	YES
3 Geo Decisions	2,000	32,700	50,000	13,752	98,452	YES
4 AMEC	2,000	31,400	49,000	14,688	97,088	YES
5 Premier Data	2,000	30,600	49,500	14,688	96,788	YES
6 Axiom	2,000	32,600	46,500	15,000	96,100	YES
7 DTM	2,000	29,800	48,500	15,000	95,300	YES
8 Geodata Services	2,000	26,600	50,000	15,000	93,600	YES
9 DJ&A	2,000	29,450	46,750	15,000	93,200	YES
10 PBS&J	1,750	32,000	44,000	15,000	92,750	YES
11 Gold Systems	2,000	30,000	45,000	15,000	92,000	YES
12 All Consulting	2,000	24,800	50,000	15,000	91,800	YES
GCS Research	2,000	26,200	48,250	15,000	91,450	YES
14 Northrop Grumman	2,000	32,600	42,750	13,752	91,102	YES
Marshall GIS	2,000	27,700	47,000	14,064	90,764	YES
16 Confluence	2,000	30,000	44,750	11,254	88,004	YES
17 Lupine Logic	2,000	24,800	44,000	15,000	85,800	YES
18 Kadrmas, Lee & Jackson	2,000	27,050	49,250	7,500	85,800	YES
19 ISMS	1,875	*	32,000	*	33,875	NO

Service Category: Information Systems Security	Organization of Proposal	Offeror Qualifications	Project Experience	References	Total	Awarded (70% of Top score)
Northrop Grumman	2,000	32,600	49,700	15,000	99,300	YES
Insure Worx	2,000	32,200	49,600	15,000	98,800	YES
Premier Data	2,000	30,600	49,000	15,000	96,600	YES
4 Assure IT	2,000	29,900	48,900	15,000	95,800	YES
Technical Edge	2,000	28,000	49,400	15,000	94,400	YES
Maximus	2,000	32,200	45,000	11,564	90,764	YES
7 MTG Management	2,000	32,400	38,600	14,376	87,376	YES
8 Wesco	2,000	32,600	43,700	7,188	85,488	YES
9 CRI	2,000	28,400	36,500	14,376	81,276	YES
Computer Geex	2,000	30,900	30,400	15,000	78,300	YES
1 Tek Systems	2,000	31,850	16,000	14,375	64,225	NO

	Master Contract for IT Services Service Category: Internet, Intranet, & eGovernment Applications	Organization of Proposal	Offeror Qualifications	Project Experience	References	Total	Awarded (70% of top score)
	Axiom IT	2,000	32,600	50,000	15,000	99,600	YES
	AMDEC	2,000	32,200	50,000	15,000	99,200	YES
	Maximus	2,000	32,200	49,260	15,000	98,460	YES
L	Foundation First	2,000	31,500	49,500	15,000	98,000	YES
5	Insure Worx	2,000	32,200	48,680	15,000	97,880	YES
	Tetra Tech	2,000	32,200	49,250	14,064	97,514	YES
7	Synesis7	2,000	31,300	49,500	14,688	97,488	YES
8	Wesco	2,000	32,600	48,420	14,376	97,396	YES
9	Analysts International	2,000	31,900	48,460	14,688	97,048	YES
10	Northrop Grumman	2,000	32,600	48,000	14,376	96,976	YES
11	Gold Systems	2,000	30,000	49,900	14,688	96,588	YES
12	PBS&J	1,750	32,000	47,000	15,000	95,750	YES
13	Tempest Tech	1,875	29,600	48,700	15,000	95,175	YES
14	Assure IT	2,000	29,900	45,850	14,376	92,126	YES
15	Automation & Management	2,000	32,200	43,460	14,064	91,724	YES
16	Wisepro	1,750	28,850	44,890	15,000	90,490	YES
17	All Consulting	2,000	24,800	45,940	15,000	87,740	YES
18	CCC	2,000	32,200	33,260	15,000	82,460	YES
19	CRI	2,000	28,400	35,000	14,688	80,088	YES
20	IT Implementers	2,000	25,600	41,700	7,500	76,800	YES
	LGS	1,750	20,400	41,400	6,876	70,426	YES
22	ACRO	2,000	20,200	28,800	14,376	65,376	NO
23	Comsys	2,000	31,400	15,800	14,064	63,264	NO
24	Skyline	*	*	*	*	-	NO

^{*}Skyline found non-reponsive.

Ī	Waster Contract for Fr	_				l	
	Services	Proposa	Qualifications	Experience	S S		d st score)
	Service Category: Mainframe Applications	Organization of	Offeror Qualif	Project Expe	References	Total	Awarded (70% of highest
1	Northrop Grumman	2,000	32,600	44,400	14,688	93,688	YES
2	Assure IT	2,000	29,900	45,650	11,250	88,800	YES
3	AMDEC	2,000	32,200	35,730	15,000	84,930	YES
4	Cross USA	2,000	27,800	40,334	14,376	84,510	YES
5	Westcon	2,000	31,700	29,550	15,000	78,250	YES
6	Insure Worx	2,000	32,200	24,500	15,000	73,700	YES
7	HCL	2,000	32,250	31,090	6,564	71,904	YES
	Tek Systems	2,000	31,850	20,550	14,376	68,776	YES
9	Coffee Cup Consulting	2,000	23,900	25,300	15,000	66,200	YES
10	CCC*	2,000	32,200	24,150	7,500	65,850	YES
	Comsys	2,000	31,400	10,850	7,500	51,750	NO
11	Haag Consulting	2,000	18,600	28,850	14,376	63,826	NO
	BHD	2,000	30,000	12,290	13,752	58,042	NO
	QCS*	2,000	30,900	9,750	5,628	48,278	NO
14	ACRO	2,000	20,200	9,050	14,376	45,626	NO

^{*}CCC and QCS no Ref for Project #1.

Service Category: Oracle-People Soft	Organization of Proposal	Offeror Qualifications	Project Experience	References	Total	Awarded (70% of top score)
1 Northrop Grumman	2,000	32,600	49,500	14,064	98,164	YES
2 Automation & Management	2,000	32,200	47,500	15,000	96,700	YES
3 Wisepro	1,750	28,850	50,000	15,000	95,600	YES
4 Maximus	2,000	32,200	45,000	15,000	94,200	YES
5 Haag Consulting	2,000	18,600	42,000	12,191	74,791	YES
6 ACRO	2,000	20,200	24,500	13,128	59,828	NO
7 Comsys ¹	2,000	31,400	1	14,064	47,464	NO
8 BHd ²	2,000	30,000	-	15,000	47,000	NO
9 HCL ³	2,000	32,250	1	-	34,250	NO

68,715

¹Listed in cover letter but no projects provided 68, ²Failed - staff aug, etc. See proj exp notes ³Failed - only 1 project, where they only took over support. See proj exp notes

Iviaster Contract for 11	_				I	1
Service Category:	Organization of Proposal	Offeror Qualifications	Project Experience	References	Total	Awarded (70% of top score)
Project Management	Organiza	Offeror	Projec	Re		A (70%)
MTG Management	2,000	32,400	50,000	15,000	99,400	YES
Axiom IT	2,000	32,600	50,000	14,688	99,288	YES
Insure Worx	2,000	32,200	50,000	15,000	99,200	YES
Maximus	2,000	32,200	50,000	15,000	99,200	YES
Wesco	2,000	32,600	50,000	14,064	98,664	YES
Foundation First	2,000	31,500	50,000	15,000	98,500	YES
HCL	2,000	32,250	50,000	14,063	98,313	YES
Synesis7	2,000	31,300	50,000	15,000	98,300	YES
Public Knowledge	2,000	30,300	50,000	15,000	97,300	YES
Analysts International	2,000	31,900	49,000	14,376	97,276	YES
Kernel Processing	2,000	31,800	50,000	13,128	96,928	YES
Assure IT	2,000	29,900	50,000	15,000	96,900	YES
CCC	2,000	32,200	50,000	11,877	96,077	YES
Fox	2,000	29,500	50,000	14,376	95,876	YES
Federal Engineering	2,000	32,200	45,750	15,000	94,950	YES
Northrop Grumman	2,000	32,600	45,000	15,000	94,600	YES
Premier Data	2,000	30,600	47,000	15,000	94,600	YES
Dye Management	2,000	29,000	48,000	15,000	94,000	YES
DJ&A	2,000	29,450	46,500	14,688	92,638	YES
PBS&J	1,750	32,000	45,000	13,440	92,190	YES
Herbert Consulting	1,750	29,000	45,000	15,000	90,750	YES
MSI	1,750	25,300	49,900	13,751	90,701	YES
QCS	2,000	30,900	50,000	6,876	89,776	YES
CRI	2,000	28,400	42,450	14,376	87,226	YES
Radiant	1,750	18,700	50,000	13,752	84,202	YES
Comsys	2,000	31,400	36,500	13,752	83,652	YES
All Consulting	2,000	24,800	38,950	15,000	80,750	YES
Vertex	1,000	27,000	50,000	-	78,000	YES
BHD	2,000	30,000	19,000	15,000	66,000	NO
ACRO	2,000	20,200	25,300	14,376	61,876	NO
ISMS	1,875	*	24,000	*	25,875	NO
Skyline	**	* *	**	* *	-	NO

^{*} ISMS did not submit Section 4-Offeror Quals; or Refs. ** Skyline proposal was non-responsive.

Service Category: Public Safety Services	Organization of Proposal	Offeror Qualifications	Project Experience	References	Total	Awarded (70% of top score)
Northrop Grumman	2,000	32,600	47,750	15,000	97,350	YES
Axiom IT Solutions	2,000	32,600	41,600	15,000	91,200	YES
DJ&A	2,000	29,450	44,350	15,000	90,800	YES
Kimball Kimball	2,000	23,250	44,350	15,000	84,600	YES
MTG Management	2,000	32,400	34,525	15,000	83,925	YES
Federal Engineering	2,000	32,200	33,300	14,688	82,188	YES

Master Contract for 11						
Service Category: Quality Assurance	Organization of Proposal	Offeror Qualifications	Project Experience	References	Total	Awarded (70% of top score)
		•	10 (00	44.07/	07.47/	\/_C
1 Maximus	2,000	32,200	48,600	14,376	97,176	YES
2 Synesis7	2,000	31,300	47,000	15,000	95,300	YES
3 Coplan	2,000	31,900	48,000	13,128	95,028	YES
4 Systest Labs	2,000	31,800	45,500	14,376	93,676	YES
5 MTG Management	2,000	32,400	43,750	14,688	92,838	YES
6 Insure Worx	2,000	32,200	43,625	15,000	92,825	YES
7 Assure IT	2,000	29,300	44,500	15,000	90,800	YES
8 Fox	2,000	29,500	44,000	14,376	89,876	YES
9 Public Knowledge	2,000	30,300	42,375	15,000	89,675	YES
o HCL	2,000	32,250	38,000	15,000	87,250	YES
1 Northrop Grumman	2,000	32,600	37,125	14,688	86,413	YES
2 QCS	2,000	30,900	37,500	7,500	77,900	YES
3 Wesco	2,000	32,600	28,600	14,376	77,576	YES
4 CCC	2,000	32,200	18,000	15,000	67,200	NO
5 CRI	2,000	28,400	19,500	14,688	64,588	NO
6 Tek Systems	2,000	31,850	11,600	14,375	59,825	NO
7 Comsys	2,000	31,400	11,000	12,816	57,216	NO
8 PBS&J	1,750	32,000	6,500	5,940	46,190	NO
9 Vertex	1,000	27,000	12,000	*	40,000	NO

^{*}No Refs

	Services Service Category: Telecommunications	Organization of Proposal	Offeror Qualifications	Project Experience	References	Total	Awarded (70% of top score)
1	Northrop Grumman	2,000	32,600	49,700	15,000	99,300	YES
2	Herbert Consulting	1,750	29,000	49,500	15,000	95,250	YES
3	CCC	2,000	32,200	45,500	14,376	94,076	YES
4	VisionNet	2,000	28,400	47,900	15,000	93,300	YES
	Qnexsys	2,000	27,150	49,100	15,000	93,250	YES
6	Federal Engineering	2,000	32,200	44,100	14,376	92,676	YES
7	CTG	2,000	29,000	43,300	15,000	89,300	YES
	LGS	1,750	20,400	46,000	*	68,150	NO
9	ISMS	1,875	* *	46,100	12,502	60,477	NO
10	HCL	2,000	26,600	18,200	7,188	53,988	NO

^{*}Refs not submitted

69,510